

Matthew R. Orr, Bar No. 211097
morr@calljensen.com
Joshua G. Simon, Bar No. 264714
jsimon@calljensen.com
CALL & JENSEN
A Professional Corporation
610 Newport Center Drive, Suite 700
Newport Beach, CA 92660
Tel: (949) 717-3000
Fax: (949) 717-3100

Attnorneys for Defendant Quincy Bioscience, LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

PHILLIP RACIES, On Behalf of Himself
and All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff.

vs.

QUINCY BIOSCIENCE, LLC, a
Wisconsin limited liability company,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:15-cv-00292 HSG

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF
DEFENDANT QUINCY BIOSCIENCE,
LLC; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS
AND AUTHORITIES**

Date: January 7, 2016

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Place: Courtroom 15 – 18th Floor
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco CA 94102

Complaint Filed: January 21, 2015
Trial Date: None Set

CALL &
JENSEN
EST 1981

1 TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT	1
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES	1
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	3
A. The Challenged Advertising Claims	3
B. The Court's Order On Defendant's Motion to Dismiss	3
C. Dr. Richard Bazinet's Expert Report	4
D. The Deposition Of Dr. Richard Bazinet.....	5
1. Dr. Bazinet Is Not an Expert on Prevagen® or AQ.....	5
2. AQ Is Not "Completely" or "Fully" Digested	5
3. Prevagen® May Provide More Than Just a Trivial Amount of Amino Acids.....	7
4. Peptides Resulting from the Digestion of Prevagen® Can Cross the BBB and Affect Neuron Function.....	8
5. Proteins and Peptides Need Not Cross the BBB to Affect Brain Function	9
6. Dr. Bazinet Criticizes the Use of Animal Studies Supporting Quincy's Advertising Claims while Relying on Animal Studies in His Own Work	9
III. LEGAL STANDARDS	10
A. Standard Of Review	10
B. CLRA Claim Elements.....	11
C. UCL Claim Elements	12
IV. LEGAL ARGUMENT.....	13
A. Plaintiff Has No Affirmative Evidence That AQ Is Completely Destroyed And Does Not Cross The BBB And Affect Brain Function.....	13

1 **TABLE OF CONTENTS(con't)**

	<u>Page</u>
3 B. Even the Generalized Opinions Plaintiff's Expert Offered	
4 Have Been Proven Wrong By <i>His Own Testimony</i>	15
5 C. No Evidence Exists That Quincy Allegedly Deceived	
6 Consumers With Respect To Body Chemistry Issues.....	17
V. CONCLUSION.....	18

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
23 Page4 **Federal Cases**

5 <i>Baba v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> ,	17
6 No. C 09-05946 RS, WL 2486353 (N.D. Cal. June 16, 2010).....	
7 <i>Brookhaven Typesetting Svcs., Inc. v. Adobe Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
8 332 Fed. Appx. 387 (9th Cir. 2009)	13
9 <i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> ,	
10 477 U.S. 317 (1986)	10
11 <i>Chavez v. Nestle USA, Inc.</i> ,	
12 No. CV 09-9192, 2011 WL 2150128 (C.D. Cal. May 19, 2011).....	13
13 <i>Cray Communications Inc. v. Novatel Computer Systems, Inc.</i> ,	
14 33 F.3d 390 (4th Cir. 1994)	11
15 <i>Dailey v. Just Energy Mktg. Corp.</i> ,	
16 No. 14-CV-02012-HSG, 2015 WL 4498430 (N.D. Cal. July 23, 2015)	10
17 <i>Devereaux v. Abbey</i> ,	
18 263 F.3d 1070 (9th Cir. 2001)	11
19 <i>Fraker v. Bayer Corp.</i> ,	
20 No. CV F 08-1564-AWI GSA, 2009 WL 5865687 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 6,	
21 2009)	12
22 <i>Gonzalez v. Drew Industries Inc.</i> ,	
23 No. CV 06-08233 DPP (JWJx), 2010 WL 3894791 (C.D. Cal. Sept.	
24 30, 2010)	11
25 <i>Johns v. Bayer Corp.</i> ,	
26 No. 09CV1935 AJB DHB, 2013 WL 1498965 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 10,	
27 2013)	12, 13, 17
28 <i>Kowalsky v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> ,	
29 771 F. Supp. 2d 1156 (N.D. Cal. 2011).....	17

CALL &
JENSEN
FIRM

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (con't)

2		<u>Page</u>
3	<i>Nissan Fire & Marine Ins. Co. Ltd v. Fritz Cos., Inc.,</i>	
4	210 F.3d 1099 (9th Cir. 2000).....	11
5	<i>Stanley v. Bayer Healthcare LLC,</i>	
6	No. 11cv862–IEG (BLM), 2012 WL 1132920 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2012)	13
7	<i>Stevens v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, NA.,</i>	
8	No. C09-03116 SI, 2010 WL 329963 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 20, 2010).....	14
9	<i>Wilson v. Hewlett-Packard Co.,</i>	
10	668 F.3d 1136 (9th Cir. 2012).....	12
11		
12	<u>State Cases</u>	
13	<i>Bains v. Moores,</i>	
14	172 Cal. App. 4th 445 (2009).....	17
15	<i>Durrell v. Sharp Healthcare,</i>	
16	183 Cal. App. 4th 1350 (2010).....	12
17	<i>Hall v. Time Inc.,</i>	
18	158 Cal. App. 4th 847 (2008).....	12
19	<i>In re Firearm Cases,</i>	
20	126 Cal. App. 4th 959 (2005).....	12
21	<i>Kwikset Corp. v. Superior Court,</i>	
22	51 Cal. 4th 310 (2011).....	12
23	<i>Nat'l Council Against Health Fraud, Inc. v. King Bio Pharm., Inc.,</i>	
24	107 Cal. App. 4th 1336 (2003).....	12, 13, 14, 16
25	<i>Nelson v. Pearson Ford Co.,</i>	
26	186 Cal. App. 4th 983 (2010).....	1

CALL &
JENSEN
EST. 1981

1 **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (con't)**2 Page3 **State Statutes**

4 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 and 17500	1, 12
5 Cal. Bus. Prof. Code § 17204.....	12
6 Cal. Civ. Code § 1750, et seq.....	1, 11, 12
7 Cal. Civ. Code § 1770.....	11, 12
8 Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)	11, 12

9 **Federal Rules**

10 Federal Rule of Evidence 56.....	10
--	----

24 CALL &
 25 JENSEN
 26 FSTTM

1 **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

2 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

3 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on January 7, 2016 at 2:00 p.m., or as soon
 4 thereafter as the matter may be heard in Courtroom 15 of the United States District
 5 Court for the Northern District of California, located on the 18th Floor at 450 Golden
 6 Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102, Defendant Quincy Bioscience, LLC
 7 (“Quincy”) will and hereby does move for summary judgment on Plaintiff’s claims
 8 under California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL”) (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200
 9 and 17500) and the Consumer Legal Remedies Act (“CLRA”) (Cal. Civ. Code § 1750,
 10 et seq.).

11 This motion is made pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 and Civil
 12 Local Rules 7-2, 7-3, 56-1, and 56-2 on the grounds that there is no genuine issue of
 13 material fact as to either of Plaintiff’s claims, and Quincy is entitled to judgment as a
 14 matter of law on both claims. Alternatively, if the Court does not grant the summary
 15 judgment disposing all Plaintiff’s claims, Quincy moves for summary judgment of the
 16 following claims and issues on the grounds that there is no genuine issue of material
 17 fact on each issue and Quincy is entitled to judgment as a matter of law:

18 (1) Plaintiff’s claims under the UCL and CLRA fail because there is no genuine
 19 issue of material fact that a portion of the protein in Quincy’s product is not
 20 completely destroyed via digestion, and Quincy is entitled to judgment as a
 21 matter of law;

22 (2) Plaintiff’s claims under the UCL and CLRA fail because there is no genuine
 23 issue of material fact that it is possible for a portion of the protein in Quincy’s
 24 product to cross the blood brain barrier and affect brain function, and Quincy
 25 is entitled to judgment as a matter of law;

26 (3) Plaintiff’s claims under the UCL and CLRA fail because Plaintiff does not
 27 raise a genuine issue of material fact that it is possible for the protein in

1 Quincy's product or a portion of it to affect brain function without crossing
 2 the blood brain barrier, and Quincy is entitled to judgment as a matter of law;
 3 (4) Plaintiff's claims under the UCL and CLRA fail because Plaintiff cannot
 4 prove that Quincy deceived consumers with regard to the digestion of the
 5 protein in Quincy's product or whether a portion of it crosses the blood brain
 6 barrier and affects brain function, and Quincy is entitled to judgment as a
 7 matter of law;
 8 (5) Plaintiff's claims under the UCL and CLRA fail based on his body chemistry
 9 allegations because Plaintiff does not raise a genuine issue of material fact that
 10 Quincy's statements are not false and deceptive, and Quincy is entitled to
 11 judgment as a matter of law.

12 This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion, the Memorandum of Points and
 13 Authorities hereunder, the concurrently filed Declaration of Joshua G. Simon and the
 14 documents and materials attached thereto, including the expert report of Dr. Richard
 15 Bazinet and the excerpts of his deposition transcript, the pleadings and papers on file
 16 herein, and such other matters as may be presented to the Court at the time of the
 17 hearing, the pleadings and records on file in this case, and such other pleadings and oral
 18 argument as may be presented to the Court at any hearing on this motion.

19 Dated: November 3, 2015

CALL & JENSEN,
 A Professional Corporation
 Matthew R. Orr
 Joshua G. Simon

23 By:/s/ Joshua G. Simon
 24 Joshua G. Simon

25 Attorneys for Defendant Quincy Bioscience, LLC

26
 27
 28
 CALL &
 JENSEN
 FST

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

In framing the issues in the present summary judgment motion, this Court held as a matter of law that Plaintiff's lawsuit cannot be based upon attacks of the clinical substantiation of Quincy's advertising claims; rather, the lawsuit could only proceed if Plaintiff could prove its "body chemistry allegations" that "the apoaequorin in the product is destroyed by the human digestive system or is of such a trivial amount that it cannot biologically affect memory or support brain function." (Doc. No. 34 at 6.) Thus, the only issue before this Court in the present motion is whether the apoaequorin ("AQ") in Prevagen® is completely destroyed via digestion and/or incapable of passing through the blood brain barrier ("BBB"). Because there is no genuine issue of material fact that AQ, or a portion of it, is not completely destroyed via digestion and that it is possible for a portion of AQ to cross the BBB and affect brain function, Plaintiff cannot proceed with his false advertising lawsuit, and Defendant is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law.

16 The only evidence proffered by Plaintiff in support of his body chemistry
17 allegations is the bare assertion of a single expert that Prevagen® cannot work as
18 advertised (an ultimate opinion that goes beyond the current scope of discovery and this
19 motion as defined by the Court). The expert argues that (1) the active ingredient in
20 Prevagen®, AQ, is no different than any other protein and is “completely” and “fully”
21 digested into amino acids; (2) the amount of AQ in the prescribed dosage of Prevagen®
22 only provides a trivial amount of amino acids; and (3) Prevagen® cannot pass the
23 blood-brain barrier (“BBB”) and can never enter the brain.

In deposition, however, the expert admitted he is not an expert on protein digestion, and had never studied or tested Prevagen® or AQ; and none of the articles he relied upon for his opinions specifically concern AQ. Perhaps most significantly, the expert further admitted in his report and during his deposition that Prevagen® is *not* “completely” or “fully” digested. Rather, AQ is broken down into *both* single amino

1 acids *and small chains of amino acids, called peptides.* Significantly, the expert
 2 admitted that peptides can be absorbed by the human body, cross the BBB and affect
 3 brain function. The expert's report does not even consider the issue of peptides
 4 resulting from AQ digestion, much less the possibility that a unique or uncommon
 5 peptide could result from the digestion of AQ and contribute to memory support or
 6 healthy brain function. Moreover, the expert admitted that both proteins and peptides
 7 can affect brain function without even crossing the BBB. The expert proffers no
 8 opinion excluding that possibility with respect to AQ or its derivative peptides after
 9 digestion. This, alone, is fatal to Plaintiff's body chemistry allegations.

10 Nor does Plaintiff proffer any evidence that Quincy knowingly deceived
 11 consumers with respect to the body chemistry issues. There is no evidence that Quincy
 12 knew, or should have known, of the purported body chemistry claims of Plaintiff's
 13 proffered expert at the time Quincy marketed and advertised its products. The expert's
 14 report criticizes only some of the studies supporting the proposition that AQ is not fully
 15 digested but omits others, and the criticisms are largely unwarranted. For example, the
 16 expert criticizes animal models used in AQ studies simply because they are animal
 17 studies and purportedly have no applicability on the human body. But the expert has
 18 used animal models himself repeatedly in the past to make hypotheses and draw
 19 conclusions about the human body.

20 For the foregoing reasons as detailed more fully below, Plaintiff has not met, and
 21 cannot meet, his burden of proving that the AQ in Prevagen® is completely destroyed
 22 via digestion and cannot cross the BBB, and that Quincy knowingly deceived
 23 consumers with respect to those issues. Pursuant to the Court's Order, Plaintiff cannot
 24 proceed with his lawsuit.

25 ///

26 ///

27

28

1 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

2 **A. The Challenged Advertising Claims**

3 Plaintiff purports he purchased Prevagen® after reading the product's label. FAC
 4 ¶ 20. Plaintiff alleges he relied on certain representations on the front of the Prevagen®
 5 label in making his purchase; namely, that the product contains a "Clinically Tested
 6 Ingredient," and that the Product "[i]mproves [m]emory" and "[s]upports" "Healthy
 7 Brain Function," "Sharper Mind," and "Clearer Thinking." *Id.* ¶ 23. Plaintiff also
 8 alleges he relied on certain representations located on the back of the Prevagen® label
 9 indicating that clinical studies have shown that Prevagen® "help[s] with mild memory
 10 problems associated with aging" and "improve[s] memory within 90 days." *Id.* ¶ 26.
 11 These representations are referred herein collectively as "Prevagen®
 12 advertising claims."

13 **B. The Court's Order On Defendant's Motion To Dismiss**

14 Quincy filed a motion to dismiss alleging that Plaintiff's lawsuit amounts to an
 15 impermissible substantiation claim. (Doc. No. 27.) This Court agreed in part and
 16 rightly dismissed Plaintiff's claims to the extent they relied on a lack of substantiation
 17 theory. (Doc. No. 34 at 4–6.) The Court, however, held that Plaintiff's lawsuit could
 18 survive the pleading stage given what the Court termed as Plaintiff's "body chemistry
 19 allegations" that "the apoaequorin in the product is destroyed by the human digestive
 20 system or is of such a trivial amount that it cannot biologically affect memory or
 21 support brain function." (Doc. No. 34 at 6.) The Court identified the specific body
 22 chemistry allegations upon which the lawsuit could proceed:

23 Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's representations that its
 24 Product improves memory and supports brain function are
 25 "false, misleading, and reasonably likely to deceive the
 26 public" because

27 one of the world's foremost experts in brain chemistry
 28 . . . has concluded that: (1) [the Product] cannot work
 29 as represented because apoaequorin, the only
 30 purported active ingredient in [the Product], is
 31 completely destroyed by the digestive system and
 32 transformed into common amino acids no different

1 than those derived from other common food products .
 2 . . . ; (2) the average daily diet contains about 75 grams
 3 of protein, contains all the required amino acids, and
 4 has about 7,500 times more amino acids than [the
 5 Product] (10 mg or 0.01 grams) and, as a result, any
 6 amino acids derived from the digestion of [the
 7 Product] would be massively diluted and could have
 8 no measurable effect on the brain; (3) ingestion of [the
 9 Product] cannot and does not have any effect on brain
 10 function or memory.

11 *Id.* ¶¶ 1-3. Plaintiff further alleges that because the Product
 12 cannot provide the promised benefits as a matter of body
 13 chemistry, “there can never be any competent and reliable
 14 scientific evidence supporting Defendant’s brain function and
 15 memory representations” and therefore the Defendant’s
 16 representations that the Product is “clinically tested” are also
 17 false and misleading under the UCL. *Id.* ¶ 5. **These** allegations
 18 are collectively referred to herein as the “body chemistry
 19 allegations.”

20 (Doc. No. 34 at 1 (*emphasis added*)). The Court further ordered Discovery shall be
 21 limited to those claims and legal theories that remain. (Doc. No. 34 at 9.)

22 C. Dr. Richard Bazinet’s Expert Report

23 In support of his body chemistry allegations, Plaintiff submits the expert report of
 24 Dr. Richard Bazinet. (Declaration of Joshua G. Simon (“Simon Decl.”) Ex. A (Bazinet
 25 Report).) Dr. Bazinet opines that, first, Prevagen® is “completely” or “fully” digested
 26 into amino acids, no different than any other protein. (*Id.* ¶¶ 8, 11, 28, 30.) Second, he
 27 argues “a daily dose of Prevagen only provides a trivial amount of amino acids
 28 compared to the substantial amount of amino acids supplied by other proteins in our
 29 daily diets.” (*Id.* ¶ 8; see also ¶¶ 16–20). Third, he argues that Prevagen® cannot pass
 30 the blood-brain barrier (“BBB”) and can never enter the brain. (*Id.* ¶¶ 8, 21–30.) In
 31 support of these opinions, Dr. Bazinet relies on articles cited in his report, documents
 32 produced by Quincy, and his 12 years of experience as a purported “expert in brain
 33 chemistry and nutritional sciences.” (*Id.* ¶ 8.)

34 Dr. Bazinet devotes more than half of his report to criticizing certain studies
 35 regarding the effects of AQ on animals. (*Id.* ¶ 31–79.) Dr. Bazinet’s report, however,

1 ignores other certain studies of AQ showing cognitive enhancement and improved
 2 memory as discussed more fully below.

3 **D. The Deposition Of Dr. Richard Bazinet**

4 Dr. Bazinet was deposed regarding the opinions in his expert report and the bases
 5 for those opinions. (Simon Decl. Ex. B (Bazinet Depo.).) Dr. Bazinet's deposition
 6 testimony plainly contradicts the key opinions from his expert report.

7 **1. Dr. Bazinet Is Not an Expert on Prevagen® or AQ**

8 Dr. Bazinet admitted he has not previously studied Prevagen® or AQ and is not
 9 an expert on those substances. (Simon Decl. Ex. B (Bazinet Depo.), 35:3–15.) Dr.
 10 Bazinet did not inspect the Prevagen® product or conduct any interviews regarding the
 11 product. (*Id.*, 31:17–25; 32:17–19; 33:9–15.) Nor did he perform any tests whatsoever
 12 on either Prevagen® or AQ. (*Id.*, 27:7–12, 21–23; 33:19–34:2; 112:25–113:5; 126:16–
 13 21.) Dr. Bazinet testified that his opinions pertain to all dietary proteins, rather than AQ
 14 in particular. (*Id.*, 66:13–24; 256:13–23; 260:17–24.) Yet Dr. Bazinet testified he
 15 specializes in lipids, not protein digestion. (*Id.*, 35:14–36:8; 37:7–10; 38:1–11.) None
 16 of the scientific articles Dr. Bazinet consulted concern AQ, and he did not consult with
 17 any of his colleagues at the University, who are experts and specialists on proteins and
 18 protein digestion. (*Id.*, 14:2–15:25, 22:1–11; 240:23–241:7.)

19 **2. AQ Is Not “Completely” or “Fully” Digested**

20 Dr. Bazinet repeatedly admitted in deposition that AQ is not “completely” or
 21 “fully” digested as stated in his report but that AQ is broken down into *both* single
 22 amino acids *and* small chains of amino acids, called peptides. (Simon Decl. Ex. B
 23 (Bazinet Depo.), 110:17–22; 121:2–8; 122:5–16; 141:17–142:16; 256:13–23; 260:17–
 24.) This admission is critical because Dr. Bazinet admits that peptides can affect brain
 25 function. (Simon Decl. Ex. B (Bazinet Depo.), 59:3–5; 142:11–16; 268:5–8; *see also*
 26 further discussion in Part II.D.4, *infra*). Furthermore, Dr. Bazinet readily admits that
 27 peptides can be absorbed into the blood of humans and cross the BBB:
 28

1 Q. Sometimes like you just recently testified, things aren't fully digested in
2 the stomach by pepsin; right?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. And so further breakdown occurs in the GI tract with those other
5 enzymes; right?

6 A. Correct.

7 Q. And that breakdown is either into smaller peptides or single amino
8 acids; right?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. And a peptide can be broken down into smaller peptides?

11 A. Correct.

12 Q. It doesn't necessarily have to be broken down into single amino acids in
13 the GI tract; right?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. And it can enter the blood as a peptide; right?

16 A. Correct.

17 Q. And we established earlier that peptides can cross the BBB; right?

18 A. So –

19 Q. Certain peptides can cross the BBB; right?

20 A. Yes, we established that certain peptides can cross the BBB.

21 (*Id.* 141:17–142:16.)

22 Dr. Bazinet testified that proteins may vary in terms of how much of the protein
23 is broken down into single amino acids as opposed to peptides. (*Id.*, 259:2–9.) But
24 because Dr. Bazinet did not test AQ, he has no knowledge of the peptides resulting
25 from the digestion of AQ or how AQ may compare to other dietary proteins in this
26 respect. (See *Id.*, 297:11–298:15.) Although he opines regarding the digestion of AQ in
27 the gut, Dr. Bazinet conceded in deposition that he performed no digestion studies on
28

CALL &
JENSEN
FSTNTM

1 AQ and, in fact, is not even a specialist on protein digestion. (*Id.*, 35:14–36:8; 37:7–10;
 2 38:1 11.)

3 Dr. Bazinet testified that the mixture of AQ and other ingredients in the
 4 Prevagen® capsules could possibly delay digestion of AQ in the gut, but he has not run
 5 any studies to determine whether the mixture would have any effect on digestion of AQ.
 6 (Simon Decl. Ex. B (Bazinet Depo.), 116:16–22; 126:16–21.) Nor is Dr. Bazinet aware
 7 of any studies regarding the possible effect of the Prevagen® mixture on the digestion
 8 of AQ. (*Id.*, 126:22–127:13.) Dr. Bazinet is aware of reports showing the existence of
 9 proteins that are resistant to pepsin, the digestive enzyme in the stomach, and he has not
 10 ruled out the possibility that AQ could be a pepsin resistant protein. (*Id.*, 133:23–
 11 134:10.)

12 **3. Prevagen® May Provide More Than Just a Trivial Amount
 13 of Amino Acids**

14 Plaintiff’s “dilution” argument compares the amount of *amino acids* generated by
 15 AQ with that generated by all dietary proteins. (Doc. No. 34 at 1). As stated above, Dr.
 16 Bazinet conceded in deposition that AQ is not completely or fully destroyed via
 17 digestion because it is broken down into peptides, not just single amino acids. (Simon
 18 Decl. Ex. B (Bazinet Depo.), 110:17–22; 121:2–8; 122:5–16; 141:17–142:16; 256:13–
 19 23; 260:17–24.) Dr. Bazinet testified that it was mathematically possible for a unique
 20 small peptide (small enough to cross the BBB) to be generated by a partial digestion of
 21 AQ. (*Id.*, 299:11–22; 261:18–263:8.) Bazinet’s report does not even consider this issue
 22 of peptides resulting from AQ digestion, much less the possibility that a unique or
 23 uncommon peptide small enough to cross the BBB could result from digestion of AQ.
 24 In fact, Dr. Bazinet only “eyeballed” AQ’s amino acid sequence and could not
 25 remember any particular portion of it. (*Id.*, 243:8–17.) He testified that he has not
 26 determined whether the peptides generated from AQ completely overlap with those of
 27 other dietary proteins, including proteins from bread and hotdogs, although a test could
 28 be run to make such a determination. (*Id.*, 297:11–298:15.) Thus, Dr. Bazinet renders

1 no opinion of the potential peptides that could result from AQ, whether they could cross
 2 the BBB, and how common or uncommon these potential AQ-derived peptides are
 3 compared to the peptides that could be generated by all other dietary proteins.

4 In fact, Dr. Bazinet testified that dietary proteins may contain 50 different types
 5 of amino acids, and the potential combinations of amino acid sequences or peptides
 6 resulting from digestion of dietary proteins could be infinite. (Simon Decl. Ex. B
 7 (Bazinet Depo.), 287:15–288:2 (“There’s all kinds of combinations. It goes on
 8 forever.”).) Although he was unable to calculate the figure, Dr. Bazinet testified that
 9 the number of different types of possible tripeptides (a sequence of three amino acids)
 10 or quadropeptides/tetrapeptides (a sequence of four amino acids) that could result from
 11 the partial breakdown of all dietary proteins would be very large. (*Id.* 287:15–289:15.)
 12 The larger the number of *possible* peptides, the less likely that the peptides *actually*
 13 *generated* by the limited number of dietary proteins a human ingests could cover all
 14 possibilities, including covering *all* possible peptides that AQ could generate. Dr.
 15 Bazinet did not provide any evidence on the likelihood of the proteins in a human diet
 16 actually generating *all* tripeptides and quadropeptides that AQ could generate. (*Id.*,
 17 297:11–298:15.)

18 In addition, in forming his opinions, Dr. Bazinet did not consider the
 19 recommended timing of Prevagen® supplementation. The prescribed use is to take
 20 Prevagen® in the morning with or without food, but not simultaneously with the
 21 purported 75,000 mg of other proteins in the average daily diet. (Simon Decl. Ex. B
 22 (Bazinet Depo.), 286:5–20; 287:6–14.)

23 **4. Peptides resulting from the Digestion of Prevagen® Can Cross
 24 the BBB and Affect Neuron Function**

25 Although Dr. Bazinet testified he is not aware of any dietary proteins crossing the
 26 BBB, he readily conceded in deposition that peptides can cross the BBB and affect
 27 brain function. (Simon Decl. Ex. B (Bazinet Depo.), 59:3–5; 142:11–16; 268:5–8; *see*
 28 *also* 261:18–263:8 (further establishing that peptides can be small enough and also have

1 high lipid solubility to cross the BBB.) Dr. Bazinet also testified that there may be
 2 receptors that allow peptides derived from AQ to cross the BBB. (*Id.*, 238:15–239:17.)
 3 What is more, Dr. Bazinet testified that he has not ruled out the possibility that AQ
 4 could bind to a serum protein that could then bind to a BBB receptor to transport AQ
 5 across the BBB. (*Id.*, 245:14–246:11.)

6 Notably, Dr. Bazinet testified that a single protein or peptide molecule can affect
 7 brain function. (Simon Decl. Ex. B (Bazinet Depo.), 277:10–278:10; 278:25–279:13.)
 8 Specifically, he testified that proteins and peptides can serve as “ligands,” ligands can
 9 bind to receptors in neurons, and a single molecule of a ligand may be sufficient to
 10 activate a single neuron and affect brain function. (*Id.*) Dr. Bazinet does not rule out
 11 the possibility of AQ or a peptide resulting from AQ acting in such a manner.

12 **5. Proteins and Peptides Need Not Cross the BBB to Affect
 13 Brain Function**

14 Dr. Bazinet testified that proteins and peptides can affect memory indirectly
 15 without crossing the BBB. (Simon Decl. Ex. B (Bazinet Depo.), 79:2–7; 75:4–76:7.)
 16 Dr. Bazinet’s report does not discuss, let alone rule out, the possibility that AQ could
 17 have an indirect—but real—effect on memory. More specifically, Dr. Bazinet testified
 18 that peptides can have functional properties, rather than just nutritional properties, and
 19 peptides can affect brain function without crossing the BBB in view of their functional
 20 properties. (*Id.*, 271:18–272:6; 272:19–273:24; 279:20–280:2.) Moreover, Dr. Bazinet
 21 testified that both proteins and peptides can act as signaling molecules, thereby
 22 affecting brain function whether or not they actually enter the brain. (*Id.*, 274:2–18.)

23 **6. Dr. Bazinet Criticizes the Use of Animal Studies Supporting
 24 Quincy’s Advertising Claims while Relying on Animal Studies in
 25 His Own Work**

26 Dr. Bazinet’s report criticizes some the animal studies supporting Quincy’s
 27 advertising claims because of “the inapplicability of drawing conclusions about what
 28 happens in humans from animal studies”. (Simon Decl. Ex. A (Bazinet Report), ¶ 57;

1 *see also Id.* ¶ 40, 73.) However, Dr. Bazinet, himself, has used animal models and
 2 studies in the past to make hypotheses and draw conclusions about the human body.
 3 (Simon Decl. Ex. B (Bazinet Depo.), 154:13–156:22.) Moreover, he is aware of famous
 4 examples of researchers studying learning using dogs as a model, such as Pavlov’s dog.
 5 (*Id.*, 234:1–22.) Dr. Bazinet also ignored the results of a certain study of 24 dogs
 6 showing that AQ improved cognitive enhancement. (*Id.*, 223:7–224:1, Ex. 11.) He
 7 testified that he did not consider the study because there were no measurements of body
 8 chemistry in it, (*Id.* 225:22–226:7, 227:8–23), but he also testified that cognitive
 9 enhancement necessarily involves issues of body chemistry. (*Id.*, 230:21–24; 231:14–
 10 20; 233:2–5, 13–21.) In other words, the *positive* cognitive results from an animal
 11 study would indicate that AQ, or at least a part of the protein, could be absorbed and
 12 have a biological effect in dogs, which may serve as a model for humans.

13

14 III. LEGAL STANDARDS

15 A. Standard of Review

16 A motion for summary judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56 must
 17 be granted when “the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions
 18 on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any
 19 material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law.”
 20 *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986) (quotation omitted). A party
 21 seeking summary judgment bears the initial burden of informing the court of the basis
 22 for its motion and of identifying those portions of the pleadings and discovery responses
 23 that demonstrate the absence of a genuine issue of material fact. *See Id.*

24 The moving party bears the initial burden of establishing that no genuine issue of
 25 material fact exists, which can be done merely by showing “that there is an absence of
 26 evidence to support the nonmoving party’s case.” *Dailey v. Just Energy Mktg. Corp.*,
 27 No. 14-CV-02012-HSG, 2015 WL 4498430, at *2 (N.D. Cal. July 23, 2015) (quoting
 28 *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 325). Summary judgment is appropriate where the opposing party

CALL &
JENSEN
FST, INC.

1 does not have enough evidence of an essential element of its claim to carry its ultimate
 2 burden of persuasion at trial. *Nissan Fire & Marine Ins. Co. Ltd v. Fritz Cos., Inc.*, 210
 3 F.3d 1099, 1102 (9th Cir. 2000); *Gonzalez v. Drew Industries Inc.*, No. CV 06-08233
 4 DPP (JWJx), 2010 WL 3894791, *2 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2010) (“On an issue as to
 5 which the nonmoving party will have the burden of proof, however, the movant can
 6 prevail merely by pointing out that there is an absence of evidence to support the
 7 nonmoving party’s case.”) This “‘showing’ can be made by pointing out through
 8 argument – the absence of evidence to support plaintiff’s claim.” *Devereaux v. Abbey*,
 9 263 F.3d 1070, 1076 (9th Cir. 2001) (en banc) (internal quotations omitted); *Cray*
 10 *Communications Inc. v. Novatel Computer Systems, Inc.*, 33 F.3d 390, 394 (4th
 11 Cir. 1994).

12 **B. CLRA Claim Elements**

13 Plaintiff’s claim arises under the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act
 14 (CLRA), Cal. Civ. Code § 1750 *et seq.* The CLRA prohibits “unfair methods of
 15 competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices undertaken by any person in a
 16 transaction intended to result or which results in the sale or lease of goods or services to
 17 any consumer.” Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a). The CLRA specifically lists the prohibited
 18 “unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices,” and a plaintiff
 19 must prove that the defendant’s conduct falls under one of the listed unlawful acts or
 20 practices. *See, e.g., Nelson v. Pearson Ford Co.*, 186 Cal. App. 4th 983, 1021-22
 21 (2010).

22 Here, Plaintiff must prove: (1) Quincy violated one or more of the provisions of
 23 § 1770(a); (2) that he relied on these alleged misrepresentation; (3) that he suffered
 24 harm; and (4) as a result of his reliance on Quincy’s misrepresentation. *Nelson v.*
 25 *Pearson Ford Co.*, 186 Cal. App. 4th 983, 1021-22 (2010). In addition, while fraud is
 26 not an essential element of CLRA, because Plaintiff’s claims sound in fraud (FAC at ¶
 27 68), Plaintiff must prove that Quincy had knowledge of its alleged fraud-based actions
 28

CALL &
JENSEN
FIRM

1 under the CLRA. *See, e.g., Wilson v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, 668 F.3d 1136, 1145-1146
 2 (9th Cir. 2012).

3 C. UCL Claim Elements

4 To prevail on a UCL claim, a plaintiff must show: (1) the defendant committed
 5 an “unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business act or practice,” (2) plaintiff “suffered injury
 6 in fact,” and (3) Plaintiff “lost money or property as a result of” defendant’s business
 7 act or practice. Cal. Bus. Prof. Code §§ 17200, 17204. Plaintiff’s burden can only be
 8 satisfied by affirmative evidence that *Quincy’s specific labels are false or misleading*,
 9 and that *Prevagen® or AQ specifically does not work*. *See Nat'l Council Against*
 10 *Health Fraud, Inc. v. King Bio Pharm., Inc.*, 107 Cal. App. 4th 1336, 1347-48 (2003)
 11 (“King Bio”) (plaintiffs have the burden of producing evidence of the falsity of the
 12 advertising claims through “testing, scientific literature, or anecdotal evidence”).
 13 Plaintiff cannot meet his burden by claiming that the representations are
 14 unsubstantiated. *Id.*; *Johns v. Bayer Corp.*, No. 09CV1935 AJB DHB, 2013 WL
 15 1498965, at *30, 36, 40, 43 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 10, 2013), *appeal dismissed* (Sept. 19,
 16 2013); *Fraker v. Bayer Corp.*, No. CV F 08-1564-AWI GSA, 2009 WL 5865687, at *8
 17 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 6, 2009).

18 To recover under the UCL, a plaintiff must demonstrate that she lost “money or
 19 property,” *i.e.* “economic injury” “as a result of” defendant’s business practice. Cal.
 20 Bus. Prof. Code § 17204; *Kwikset Corp. v. Superior Court*, 51 Cal. 4th 310, 333 (2011).
 21 The UCL’s “as a result of” language “imposes an actual reliance requirement.” *Durrell*
 22 *v. Sharp Healthcare*, 183 Cal. App. 4th 1350, 1362-63 (2010); *see also Kwikset Corp. v.*
 23 *Superior Court*, 51 Cal. 4th 310, 326-27 & n.9 (2011); *Hall v. Time Inc.*, 158 Cal. App.
 24 4th 847, 855-58 (2008); *cf. In re Firearm Cases*, 126 Cal. App. 4th 959, 977-82 (2005).

25 ///

26 ///

27
 28

CALL & JENSEN
 FIRM

1 **IV. LEGAL ARGUMENT**2 **A. Plaintiff Has No Affirmative Evidence That AQ Is Completely**
3 **Destroyed And Does Not Cross The BBB And Affect Brain Function.**

4 Under California law, Plaintiff “bears the burden of proving the advertising
5 claims to be false or misleading.” *King Bio*, 107 Cal. App. 4th at 1345, 1348; *see also*
6 *Johns v. Bayer Corp.*, 2013 WL 1498965, at *30 (“[I]n a false advertising case under
7 the UCL and CLRA, the plaintiff ‘bears the burden of proving that the defendant’s
8 advertising claim is false or misleading’”) (quoting *King Bio*); *Stanley v. Bayer*
9 *Healthcare LLC*, No. 11cv862-IEG (BLM), 2012 WL 1132920, at *6 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 3,
10 2012) (granting summary judgment motion where plaintiff’s claims relied on
11 inconclusive expert testimony and defendant had not substantiated its labeling); *Chavez*
12 *v. Nestle USA, Inc.*, No. CV 09-9192, 2011 WL 2150128, at *5-6 (C.D. Cal. May 19,
13 2011); *Fraker v. Bayer Corp.*, No. CV F 08-10 15649, 2009 WL 5865687, at *8 (E.D.
14 Cal. Oct. 6. 2009). In this case, to survive summary judgment, Plaintiff must support
15 his body chemistry allegations with **affirmative evidence** regarding Prevagen® or AQ,
16 specifically. *See King Bio*, 107 Cal. App. 4th at 1347; *Johns v. Bayer Corp.*, 2013 WL
17 1498965, at *36 (“Accordingly, **in the absence of affirmative scientific evidence**
18 available during the Class Period that proves that zinc and vitamin E did not support
19 prostate health . . . Plaintiffs’ claims are based on “lack of substantiation” rather than
20 proof of falsity.”) (*emphasis added*).

21 Plaintiff’s sole expert does not offer any affirmative evidence that Prevagen® or
22 AQ, specifically, is completely destroyed via digestion and does not cross the BBB and
23 affect brain function. Part II.D.1, *supra*; *see King Bio*, 107 Cal. App. 4th at 1347; *Johns*
24 *v. Bayer Corp.*, 2013 WL 1498965, at *1, 36, 40, 43; *cf Brookhaven Typesetting Svcs.,*
25 *Inc. v. Adobe Sys., Inc.*, 332 Fed. Appx. 387, 390 (9th Cir. 2009) (affirming summary
26 judgment because “the expert’s declaration did not provide a sustainable basis upon
27 which a triable case of misappropriation could be founded” and “[t]he only specific
28 examples were conclusory, with no detail provided”). Rather, Plaintiff’s expert merely

1 hypothesizes regarding the digestion of AQ in the human body without any real testing
 2 or AQ-specific literature, and then he cherry picks certain evidence showing AQ's
 3 efficacy and criticizes it while ignoring other substantial evidence. On this record,
 4 Plaintiff cannot survive summary judgment.

5 The affirmative evidence a plaintiff has the burden to produce at the summary
 6 judgment stage must be specific. It must be directly related to the accused product. In
 7 *King Bio*, the plaintiff alleged that defendant falsely advertised the efficacy of its
 8 homeopathic drug products. 107 Cal. App. 4th at 1347. Plaintiff presented expert
 9 testimony of the inefficacy of homeopathic remedies in general, but presented no
 10 evidence concerning the efficacy of King Bio's products specifically. *Id.* The court
 11 noted that "homeopathic remedies are marketed and readily available for testing by a
 12 plaintiff," and that just because the plaintiff did "not wish to bear the expense of
 13 proving its case does not mean that the burden and expense should be shifted to King
 14 Bio." *Id.* at 1348.

15 Accordingly, the California Court of Appeals affirmed the Superior Court's
 16 granting of judgment for King Bio, holding that the plaintiff had failed to meet its
 17 burden "of producing evidence that the challenged advertising claims of King Bio are
 18 false or misleading." *Id.* at 1344; *see also* *Id.* at 1340; *Stevens v. JPMorgan Chase*
 19 *Bank, NA.*, No. C09-03116 SI, 2010 WL 329963, at *4-5 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 20, 2010)
 20 (dismissing false advertising and misleading practices complaint based on *King Bio*
 21 when complaint provided nothing more than mere labels and conclusions).

22 Much like the plaintiff's expert in *King Bio*, what Dr. Bazinet offers here is a
 23 theory regarding dietary proteins in general, and not the product at issue. In support of
 24 his opinion that the Prevagen® advertising claims are false, Dr. Bazinet, Plaintiff's sole
 25 expert, opines on three points: (1) Dietary proteins are "completely" or "fully" digested
 26 to single amino acids; (2) AQ would generate the same amino acids as the other dietary
 27 proteins, so the effect of 10 mg of AQ would be "diluted" by 75,000 mg of other
 28 proteins a person ingests every day; and (3) Ingested proteins cannot have any effect on

CALL &
JENSEN
FST, INC.

1 brain function or memory. None of these opinions is based on any evidence specific to
 2 AQ or Prevagen®. Therefore, Plaintiff has failed to present any competent evidence to
 3 prevent a summary judgment in favor of Quincy.

4 **B. Even the Generalized Opinions Plaintiff's Expert Offered Have Been
 5 Proven Wrong By *His Own Testimony***

6 As shown in the fact section above, each of the generalized opinions by
 7 Dr. Bazinet is contradicted by his own report and deposition testimony.

8 With respect to Dr. Bazinet's first point, that of "complete" and "full" digestion
 9 of AQ, he conceded during deposition that (a) he had never studied or tested Prevagen®
 10 or AQ; (b) AQ is digested into both amino acids *and* peptides; (c) some peptides can
 11 affect brain function without crossing the BBB; and (d) some peptides can cross the
 12 BBB and affect brain function. Part II.D.1 and 2, *supra*. Dr. Bazinet's report does not
 13 even consider the issue of peptides resulting from AQ digestion, much less the
 14 possibility that a unique or uncommon peptide small enough to cross the BBB could
 15 result from digestion of AQ. In fact, Dr. Bazinet renders no opinion whatsoever
 16 regarding the potential peptides that could result from AQ digestion and whether they
 17 could cross the BBB.

18 On Dr. Bazinet's second point, that of "dilution" by dietary proteins, his report
 19 does not consider the recommended timing of AQ ingestion (to be taken first thing in
 20 the morning on an empty stomach) and how that may affect the body's digestion and
 21 absorption of AQ. (Simon Decl. Ex. B (Bazinet Depo.), 286:5–20; 287:6–14.)

22 Moreover, the "dilution" allegation hinges on the false assumption that all dietary
 23 proteins, including AQ, are digested all the way down to amino acids. Plaintiffs argued
 24 that "common amino acids" generated by protein digestion are "no different" from each
 25 other regardless of their sources. (Doc. No. 34 at 1). But Dr. Bazinet testified that it
 26 was mathematically possible for AQ to generate a *unique* small peptide (small enough
 27 to cross the BBB) that is different from all peptides generated by other dietary proteins.
 28 (Simon Decl. Ex. B (Bazinet Depo.), 299:11–22; 261:18–263:8.) If an AQ-derived

1 peptide is uncommon or even unique, it would not be “diluted” to trivial amounts by
 2 other types of peptides generated by other dietary proteins.

3 Furthermore, even if “dilution” of AQ-derived peptides would occur, such
 4 “dilution” would not save Plaintiff’s case from summary judgment. Dr. Bazinet
 5 testified that a single molecule of peptide can affect brain function. (*Id.*, 277:10–
 6 278:10; 278:25–279:13.) One example he testified about is that proteins and peptides
 7 can be ligands, ligands can bind to receptors in neurons, and a single molecule of a
 8 ligand may be sufficient to activate a neuron and affect brain function. (*Id.*) Dr.
 9 Bazinet’s report does not discuss, let alone rule out the possibility of AQ or an AQ-
 10 derived peptide acting in such a manner. In that sense, no amount of a protein or
 11 peptide that acts as a ligand is trivial. A single molecule could be effective.

12 On Dr. Bazinet’s third point, that ingested proteins cannot affect brain function,
 13 his deposition testimony revealed three important points that contradicted his earlier,
 14 bare assertion. **First**, he testified that proteins and peptides can affect memory
 15 indirectly *without* crossing the BBB. (Simon Decl. Ex. B (Bazinet Depo.), 79:2–7;
 16 75:4–76:7; 271:18–272:6; 272:19–273:24; 279:20–280:2; 274:2–18.) His report does
 17 not discuss, much less exclude, the possibility that AQ has an indirect effect on brain
 18 function or memory. **Second**, Dr. Bazinet, again, testified that peptides generated by
 19 partial digestion of ingested proteins *can* cross the BBB. (*Id.*, 59:3–5; 142:11–16;
 20 268:5–8.) Dr. Bazinet also testified that there may be receptors that allow peptides
 21 derived from AQ to cross the BBB. (*Id.*, 238:15–239:17.) **Third**, Dr. Bazinet testified
 22 that a single molecule that crossed the BBB and entered the brain could act as a ligand
 23 and activate a neuron. (*Id.*, 277:10–278:10; 278:25–279:13.)

24 Therefore, Plaintiff’s reliance on a generalized, unsupported and rescinded
 25 “complete” digestion and “dilution” theory is insufficient to defeat summary judgment.
 26 Plaintiff should not be permitted to have his case move forward on bare hypotheses and
 27 theories. *King Bio.* 107 Cal. App. 4th at 1345-46.
 28

C. No Evidence Exists That Quincy Allegedly Deceived Consumers With Respect To Body Chemistry Issues

To establish liability under fraud-based claims, Plaintiff must show not only the existence of falsity, but also that Quincy “knew, or through the exercise of reasonable care should have known” of the alleged falsity at the time it marketed and advertised its products. *Kowalsky v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, 771 F. Supp. 2d 1156, 1162 (N.D. Cal. 2011); *see also Baba v. Hewlett-Packard Co.*, No. C 09- 05946 RS, 2010 WL 2486353, at *7 (N.D. Cal. June 16, 2010) (dismissing UCL claim in part because plaintiffs did not sufficiently allege knowledge of the alleged defects); *Bains v. Moores*, 172 Cal. App. 4th 445, 455 (2009) (“To avoid summary adjudication of [their] fraud claim, [plaintiffs were] required to produce evidence of (1) a misrepresentation, (2) knowledge of falsity (or ‘scienter’), (3) intent to defraud, *i.e.*, to induce reliance; (4) justifiable reliance, and (5) resulting damage.” (internal quotation marks omitted) (alterations in original)).

In *Kowalsky*, the court performed a detailed analysis of UCL and CLRA cases, and concluded that “when federal district courts have considered fraudulent prong claims based on representations about defective products, they have generally required a plausible showing that the defendant knew of the alleged defect when it made the representation alleged to be deceptive.” *Id.* at 1160-63 (citations omitted).

Plaintiff does not have a single fact that would tend to show deception on the part of Quincy with respect to Plaintiff's body chemistry allegations. There is no evidence that Quincy knew, or through the exercise of reasonable care should have known, of the purported body chemistry claims of Plaintiff's proffered expert at the time Quincy marketed and advertised its products. Since Plaintiff cannot meet this burden of proving his body chemistry allegations and that Quincy knowingly deceived consumers with respect to those issues, he cannot survive summary judgment. *Johns v. Bayer Corp.*, 2013 WL 1498965, at *1 ("in the absence of *affirmative evidence* that scientific research *did not support* the Prostate Cancer Claim from December 2008 until May 31,

1 2010, the *strength* of Bayer's evidence is irrelevant and Plaintiffs' claims are based on
 2 'lack of substantiation' rather than proof of falsity") (emphasis added).

3

4 **V. CONCLUSION**

5 For the foregoing reasons, in light of the absence of affirmative evidence
 6 submitted by Plaintiff and his expert, Plaintiff has not met, and cannot meet, his burden
 7 of proffering evidence of his body chemistry allegations. Given his expert's testimony,
 8 there is no genuine issue of material fact that AQ is not completely destroyed via
 9 digestion and that it is possible for a portion of AQ to cross the BBB and affect brain
 10 function. Pursuant to this Court's Order, Plaintiff cannot proceed with his false
 11 advertising lawsuit. Therefore, Quincy respectfully requests that the Court enter
 12 judgment in favor of Quincy and against the Plaintiff in this case.

13

14 Dated: November 3, 2015

15 **CALL & JENSEN**
 16 A Professional Corporation
 17 Matthew R. Orr
 18 Joshua G. Simon

19 By:/s/ Joshua G. Simon
 20 Joshua G. Simon

21 Attorneys for Defendant Quincy Bioscience, LLC

22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587

588

589

590

591

592

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

654

655

656

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

723

724

725

726

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756

757

758

759

760

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

803

804

805

806

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816

817

818

819

820

821

822

823

824

825

826

827

828

829

830

831

832

833

834

835

836

837

838

839

840

841

842

843

844

845

846

847

848

849

850

851

852

853

854

855

856

857

858

859

860

861

862

863

864

865

866

867

868

869

870

871

872

873

874

875

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891

892

893

894

895

896

897

898

899

900

901

902

903

904

905

906

907

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973

974

975

976

977

978

979

980

981

982

983

984

985

986

987

988

989

990

991

992

993

994

995

996

997

998

999

1000

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on November 3, 2015, I electronically filed the foregoing document described as **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT OF DEFENDANT QUINCY BIOSCIENCE, LLC; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES** with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF System which will send notification of such filing via electronic mail to all counsel of record.

/s/ Joshua G. Simon
Joshua G. Simon

CALL &
JENSEN
EST. 1981